

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A) Applicable Authority

A patent application's claimed invention is obvious when the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art. 35 U.S.C. § 103; See, also, *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 14 (1966).

B) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,473,102 issued to Rodden et al. (hereinafter "Rodden") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,020 issued to Buote et al., (hereinafter "Buote").

Claims 1, 3–9, and 11–14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodden in view of Buote. As Rodden and Buote, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 3, 5–8, and 11–14, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Noting in Buote and Rodden, fairly describes or suggests, among other things, “determining, by the computer system, whether a display size and display screen position are specified in application programming interface call for the graphical window; [and] automatically maximizing the size of the graphical window on the display screen if the screen resolution is below the pre-determined threshold value, wherein a maximize

button for the graphical window is replaced with a restore button,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Unlike Buote and Rodden, individually or in combination, the invention of amended independent claim 1 provides selective maximization based on screen resolution and whether a window size and position are specified. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of amended independent claim 1 and allowance of amended independent claim 1.

Claims 3 and 5–7 depend from amended independent claim 1 and further define novel features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 3 and 5–7 are allowable over Buote and Rodden for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) (2006).

With respect to independent claim 8, Rodden and Buote, fail to teach or suggest, among other things, “determining, for the viewing window, whether a display size and display screen position are specified for the viewing window by monitoring the application-programming interface call, and if a size and position are specified in the application-programming interface call, rendering the viewing window at the specified size and in the specified position, and if a display size or display screen position are not specified in the application-programming interface call, determining, by the computer system, current screen resolution; [and] automatically maximizing, by the computer system, the size of the viewing window on the display screen if the current screen resolution is below the selected resolution threshold.”

Contrary to the Office’s contention, both Rodden and Buote fail to teach, suggest or provide a motivation for the claimed selective window maximization. The invention

of amended independent claim 8 requires, among other things, that window size and position are not specified and the current threshold is below a predetermined threshold. The prior art, including Rodden and Buote fail to teach or suggest the claimed requirements of amended independent claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of amended independent claim 8 and allowance of amended independent claim 8. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) (2006).

Claims 11–13 depend from amended independent claim 8 and further define novel features of claimed embodiment. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 8, the obviousness rejection for claims 11–13 should be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 14, Rodden and Buote, fail to teach or suggest, among other things, “creating a viewing window for the display of information on the display screen, wherein the viewing window has a restore button that replaces a maximize button and the viewing window is not a window that conveys system information; automatically rendering the viewing window in a maximized size on the display screen, if the viewing window is capable of being maximized and determining if the restore button has been initiated when the viewing window is the maximized size; and reducing the size of the viewing window on the display screen by a pre-determined amount, if the restore button has been initiated.”

Unlike Rodden and Buote, the invention of amended independent claim 14 provides a maximized window with a restore button that reduces the size of the maximized window by a predetermined amount. The disclosures of Rodden and Buote do not fairly teach, suggest or provide a motivation for the claimed restore button.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of amended independent claim 14 and allowance of amended independent claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 3, 5–8, and 11–14 are pending in this application. In view of the remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue. Should any issues remain prior to issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.81059.

If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 (Attorney Docket No: MFCP.81059).

Respectfully submitted,

/Monplaisir Hamilton/

Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 474-6550